

REMARKS

This application contains claims 1-30. Claims 1, 13, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiners Singh and Bashore for the courtesy of a personal interview with Applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856), held in the USPTO on December 14, 2005. At the interview, Mr. Colb explained the distinction of the present invention over Rawat (cited below). Mr. Colb specifically pointed out that Rawat examines the code behind an electronic form before the form is filled out, whereas the invention claimed in the present patent application uses contents filled into the fields to assign field labels. The Examiners suggested amending the independent claims to more clearly distinguish over Rawat by specifying that rules applicable to the filled-in contents of the fields are used in assigning field labels. The Examiners also suggested that the "reading" and "assigning" steps in claim 1 be amended to recite "machine reading" and "machine assigning" in order to overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiners.

Claims 1-24 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13, as suggested by the Examiners, in order to recite that the functions of reading the field contents and assigning field labels are carried out by machine. This amendment is clearly supported by Fig. 1 in the present patent application and the accompanying description in the specification. In view of this amendment, claims 1 and 13 are believed to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, as are claims 2-12, 14-24 and 30, which depend from these independent claims.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15, 18-22 and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rawat et al. (U.S. Patent 6,662,340). Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, 26, 28 and 29, as agreed in the interview, in order to clarify the distinction of the present invention over Rawat.

Rawat describes a client-side program that automatically fills out fields of forms contained in electronic documents. As explained in the interview and in Applicant's

response to the previous Official Action in this case, Rawat explicitly deals with situations in which a blank form is provided (as illustrated in his Figs. 1 and 2, for example). He provides a tool for filling out the blank fields of the form by analyzing the program code that defines the appearance of the blank form (see col. 4, lines 27-62).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for processing a document after contents have been filled into the fields on the document. The contents are read out and used in assigning labels to the fields, responsive to rules that are applicable to the filled-in contents.

Although both Rawat and the present invention deal with the problem of assigning labels to fields, the approaches are totally different. Rawat examines the code behind an electronic form before the form is filled out, in order to determine how the form should be filled out. The invention recited in claim 1 takes the form after it has been filled out and examines the contents filled into the fields based on rules applicable to the filled-in contents. Rawat neither teaches nor suggests that rules applicable to the filled-in contents of the fields of a form might be used in assigning labels to the fields. Rawat's use of a "Field label dictionary" (col. 7, lines 19-23, cited by the Examiner in the Response to Arguments) also relates to the "field's programmatic name," i.e., the name used in the computer program code behind the electronic form, rather than to any filled-in field contents.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Rawat. In view of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2, 3 and 6-10 are believed to be patentable, as well.

Claims 13 and 25 respectively recite apparatus and a computer software product, which operate on principles similar to the method of claim 1. These claims have been amended in like manner to claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, claims 13 and 25 as amended are believed to be patentable over Rawat, as are claims 14, 15 and 18-22, which depend from claim 13.

Claims 26, 28 and 29 respectively recite a method, apparatus and computer software product for computerized data processing. These claims have been amended in like manner to claims 1, 13 and 25, in order to clarify that labels are assigned to the fields in a form on a computer responsively to information that has been filled into the

Serial No. 09/740,733

Customer No. 07278

Attorney Docket No. 06727/0001088-US0


fields and to rules applicable to the filled-in contents of the fields. As explained above in reference to claim 1, Rawat neither teaches nor suggests the use of information that has been filled into the fields of a form in order to identify the fields themselves. Therefore, claims 26, 28 and 29, as amended, are believed to be patentable over Rawat, as is claim 27, which depends from claim 26.

Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 16, 17, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Rawat in view of Hetherington (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0010714) or in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent 6,199,079). In view of the patentability of claims 1 and 13, dependent claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 16, 17, 23 and 24 are believed to be patentable, as well.

Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Date: December 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted

 51,401
for

S. Peter Ludwig

Reg. No. 25,351

Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY, P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, NY 10150-5257

212.527.7700